

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific
knowledge, policies, or practices

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

NOTICES OF JUDGMENT UNDER THE INSECTICIDE ACT

1950-1975

LIBRARY
CURRENT SERIAL RECORD
JUL 1 1947
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The notices of judgment herewith relate to cases instituted in the United States district courts and are approved for publication, as provided in section 4 of the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331).



Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 7, 1947.

1950. Misbranding of "Kitchen Klenzer." U. S. v. 681 cases, more or less, each containing 40 13-ounce cans of "Kitchen Klenzer." Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (I. & F. No. 2366, I. D. No. 9926.)

An examination of "Kitchen Klenzer" showed that this product consisted of siliceous materials, carbonates of sodium, soap, and a small amount of mineral oil.

On August 29, 1944, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation at St. Louis, Mo., of 681 cases of a product labeled and known as "Kitchen Klenzer," alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about May 1, 1944, by the Midland Warehouse, Inc., from Chicago, Ill., and charging that the product was a misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that it consisted entirely of inert ingredients that would not prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate fungi (bacteria), and the label did not bear a statement of the correct names and percentage amounts of each and every inert ingredient and the fact that the said ingredients were inert.

The product was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statement, "Kitchen Klenzer Removes Germs As You Clean * * * Use for Antiseption! (Antiseptic Action)," borne on the shipping case labels, and the statements, "Kitchen Klenzer USE Kitchen Klenzer for Antiseption! (Antiseptic Action) Remove Germs As You Clean * * * Kitchen Klenzer cleans antiseptically Bath Tubs Faucets Linoleum Sinks Stoves Steel Knives Pots, Pans Kettles Kitchen Floors Refrigerators Painted Walls Milk Bottles Windows Crockery Stone Steps Statuary Brass Golf Clubs Machinery Automobile Tires, Parts and Chromium * * * Recommended Especially for Bath Rooms Porcelain Enamelware Adopted by Hospitals For Cleaning Operating Rooms Surgical Instruments Tables Marble Floors Mosaic, Tile," borne on the labels affixed to the cans containing the product, were false and misleading and, by reason of such statements, the product was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser as the product did not clean antiseptically, did not remove all germs, did not exert antiseptic action, did not clean antiseptically the articles specified, and was not suitable as a disinfectant for the locations, establishments, and articles implied by the quoted recommendations.

On October 7, 1944, the claimant, Fitzpatrick Bros., Inc., of Chicago, Ill., filed exceptions to the libel. On May 23, 1945, the court overruled the claimant's

exceptions to said libel. On June 13, 1945, the claimant filed an answer to the libel. On June 29, 1945, the case was tried, by the court, upon its merits. The court, having considered all and singular the evidence, directed the parties to file briefs for consideration.

Thereafter, on November 19, 1945, after consideration of briefs submitted by counsel, the court rendered the following decision:

"This is a libel filed by the United States under the Insecticide Act, Title 7, U. S. C., Section 121, et seq., against 681 cases, more or less, each containing 40 13-ounce cans of 'Kitchen Klenzer'. The libel is based on and alleges that said Kitchen Klenzer was intended to be used as a 'fungicide' within the meaning of the act and that it was misbranded under the act, for two reasons: (1) That it consisted of inert ingredients and the percentage thereof was not shown; and (2) that certain statements appearing on the labels of the cans were false and misleading.

"The cans in question are cylindrical in shape, about 5 inches high and 9½ inches in circumference. Covering the entire side surface of the can is a paper label, which states at the top the name, 'Kitchen Klenzer', and contains below a picture of a woman admiring her reflection in a freshly scoured pan, and various other writings. On the bottom of the label on both sides, immediately under the picture, are the words in red on a white background 'Remove Germs As You Clean', and to the right of those words are the words 'Use Kitchen Klenzer for ANTISEPTIC! (Antiseptic Action)'. The last phrase is in blue ink except for the capitalized word 'ANTISEPTIC!', which is in red ink.

"In a thin strip on one side of the can, in a red background and reading vertically, are the words 'Kitchen Klenzer cleans antiseptically Bath Tubs Faucets Linoleum Sinks Stoves Steel Knives Pots, Pans Kettles Kitchen Floors Refrigerators', etc. On the other side of the can, also on a red background and reading vertically, are the words 'The Proved Cleanser That Cleans Faster Lasts Longer—Recommended Especially for Bath Rooms Porcelain Enamelware—Adopted by Hospitals For Cleaning Operating Rooms Surgical Instruments Tables Marble Floors Mosaic, Tile'.

"The manufacturer of Kitchen Klenzer, and claimant in this libel, is Fitzpatrick Brothers of Chicago, Ill. They base their claim to the release of the libeled product upon the ground that Kitchen Klenzer is not a fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act and was not and could not have been misbranded. The evidence has shown (and both parties admit) that Kitchen Klenzer is made up entirely of inert substances and has no action other than a scouring action similar to that contained in many other commercial scouring powders. The claimant, therefore, bottoms its case principally on this admission that Kitchen Klenzer is not *in fact* a fungicide or, in other words, will not kill fungi. Therefore, the issue presented is whether, in spite of the fact that Kitchen Klenzer is admittedly not a fungicide, it can still come within the jurisdiction of the Insecticide Act.

"Title 7 U. S. C., Section 126, provides in part that:

'The introduction into any State or Territory or the District of Columbia from any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or from any foreign country, or shipment to any foreign country, of any insecticide, or Paris green, or lead arsenate, or *fungicide which is adulterated or misbranded* within the meaning of this chapter is hereby prohibited'. (Emphasis supplied by the court.)

"Section 133 provides for the labeling of any such product and Section 122 of the act gives the following definition of a fungicide:

'The term "fungicide" as used in this chapter shall include any substance or mixture of substances *intended to be used for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any and all fungi* that may infest vegetation or be present in any environment whatsoever'. (Emphasis supplied by the court.)

"Thus, under the act the issue as to whether Kitchen Klenzer is a fungicide depends on whether it is 'a substance intended to be used for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any or all fungi'. To answer this the court must determine two questions: (1) Whether Congress intended to include in the scope of the act any substances except ones that were actual working insecticides or fungicides, or, stated another way, whether the coverage of the act is broad enough to include a product not in fact a fungicide, which holds itself out to

be one; and (2) whether, if the coverage of the act is broad enough, the particular product here has, as a matter of fact, held itself out or purported to be a fungicide.

"The first problem is relatively easy of solution. In the Insecticide Act Congress did not merely prohibit the misbranding or adulteration of products which were in fact fungicides. It went further and included things which were 'intended to be used' as fungicides. This court does not believe that when it used the word 'intended' Congress spoke ill-advisedly, or had in mind the manufacturer's subjective intent as to the product's efficacy. The act was passed for the protection of the public, and a reading of the entire chapter convinces one that Congress intended that the public be protected not only from misbranded actual fungicides, but from the misbranding or adulteration of all matters holding themselves out to be fungicides, and employed the words 'intended to be used' in reference to objective intent as evidenced by what the product holds itself out to be. Any other construction of this statute would lead to the absurd result that a manufacturer could actually label his product a fungicide and yet avoid the application of the act by reservations and his own knowledge of its inefficacy.

"The second question, as to whether any, all, or the combination of words employed on these labels amount to evidence of an objective intent that said Kitchen Klenzer be used as a fungicide, requires an analysis of the thought conveyed. The label states 'Remove Germs as You Clean' and 'Use Kitchen Klenzer for ANTISEPTION! (Antiseptic Action).' Do these words, either used singly or in combination, hold forth that Kitchen Klenzer is an effective fungicide? The court believes that they do and would be so taken by the general public regardless of what claimant's intent may have been.

"The Insecticide Act empowers the Secretaries of the Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce to make rules and regulations to carry out its provisions, and pursuant to that power a regulation has been promulgated to define 'fungi'. It reads:

"'Fungi' means all non-chlorophyll-bearing plants of a lower order than mosses and liverworts (i. e. non-chlorophyll-bearing thallophytes), as, for example, rusts, smuts, mildews, molds, yeast, and bacteria.'

"From this definition it can be seen that 'fungi' includes bacteria, and the expert evidence introduced in this case conclusively authenticated the regulations in this. Therefore, anything that prevents, destroys, repels, or mitigates bacteria would be a fungicide. The label refers, however, to germs and antiseption. A 'germ', in the popular sense, is certainly a reference to bacteria, and to say 'Remove Germs As You Clean' is certainly an intimation that the product will eradicate bacteria or fungi. The claimant, Fitzpatrick Brothers, however, argues in defense of this sentence that any scouring matter removes germs, in the sense that it displaces them from one locale to another, but that that sentence does not say that the germs will be destroyed as by a fungicide. But looking at the sentence as a whole the court believes that there is a very definite implication in it that the germs (meaning bacteria) will be more than displaced. The word 'Remove' is frequently used in the sense of 'to get rid of' or 'to eradicate', as in the illustrative sentence given by Webster, 'to remove the causes of poverty.' Thus read, to say a thing removes germs would be tantamount to saying it prevents, destroys, repels, or mitigates them within the meaning of the statute.

"But these words are not alone or the most obnoxious ones. The references to 'ANTISEPTION! (Antiseptic Action),' to 'antiseptically', and to the product's hospital users, appear to the court even more of a representation that the product will destroy bacteria or fungi. Webster's New International Dictionary defines 'Antiseption' as 'Antisepsis', and defines 'Antisepsis' as—

'The process of inhibiting the growth and multiplication of microorganisms; the prevention of sepsis by antiseptic means. Cf. STERILIZATION, DISINFECTION, ASEPSIS'.

'Antiseptic' is defined by that dictionary as—

'A substance that opposes sepsis, putrefaction, or decay; one that prevents or arrests the growth or action of microorganisms, either by inhibiting their activity or by destroying them;—used especially of agents applied, to living tissues. Cf. DISINFECTANT, GERMICIDE.'

The words are certainly on the label for some purpose, and to the court they most certainly convey a meaning that Kitchen Klenzer will do more than scour. In *Bradley vs. United States*, 264 Fed. 79, referring to a label on a bottle, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals very aptly said:

'Unless this means that the water did contain elements or ingredients which would alleviate or cure the diseases named, when taken according to the directions thereon contained, it was a waste of printer's ink.'

Paraphrasing this, the court is at a loss to know why the claimant would waste printer's ink (and some of it red) unless some inference was sought by this label over and beyond that of a pure cleaning agent. The court is aware that many people might know that Kitchen Klenzer is inert and would not be fooled by the label, but the fact that the untruth may be patent to some and may not mislead the person of discernment is, of course, no defense if the product is in fact misbranded. This court, however, can very well conceive how a not unreasonable person, relying on this label, might erroneously employ the accused product for disinfecting dishes from a sickroom, or some such inappropriate use. The Supreme Court of the United States, in *U. S. vs. 95 Barrels of Vinegar*, 265, U. S. 438, a case under the Food and Drug Act, said:

'The statute is plain and direct. Its comprehensive terms *condemn every statement, design, and device which may mislead or deceive. Deception may result from the use of statements not technically false or which may be literally true.* The aim of the statute is to prevent that resulting from indirection and ambiguity, as well as from statements which are false. *It is not difficult to choose statements, designs, and devices which will not deceive.* Those which are ambiguous and liable to mislead should be read favorably to the accomplishment of the purpose of the act. The statute applies to food, and the ingredients and substances contained therein. It was enacted to enable purchasers to buy food for what it really is.' (Italics supplied.)

The reasoning there can well be applied to the case of Kitchen Klenzer although the court is of the opinion that the deception here is neither indirect nor ambiguous, but clear and direct.

"The court therefore holds that the accused cans of Kitchen Klenzer are fungicides and within the jurisdiction of the act, and since they do not bear on their labels the names and amounts of inert ingredients, as required by 7 U. S. C., Section 131, are as a matter of law misbranded. In addition, however, the court is of the opinion that even were the inert ingredients stated on the labels, for the reasons previously discussed, misbranding would be present because the labels deceive or mislead within the meaning of that part of the act which reads:

* * * For the purpose of this chapter an article shall be deemed to be misbranded * * * in the case of * * * fungicides * * * if it be labeled or branded so as to deceive or mislead the purchaser. * * * 7 U. S. C., Section 131.

Therefore, a judgment will be entered overruling the claim of Fitzpatrick Brothers and ordering the product condemned. Counsel will forthwith submit Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and a proper decree for approval and signature."

Thereafter on the 18th day of December 1945, the court rendered its decree and directed that the product be destroyed.

1951. Misbranding of "GermiteX." U. S. v. Five 350-pound barrels of "GermiteX." Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released to claimant for relabeling in compliance with legal requirements. (I. & F. No. 2373. I. D. 9700.)

Analysis of a sample of "GermiteX" showed that this product consisted of crystalline zinc silicofluoride. The label bore false representation that the product was an antiseptic, germ killer, and moth repellent.

On November 8, 1944, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation at New York, N. Y., of five 350-pound barrels of "GermiteX," alleging that the product had been

shipped in interstate commerce, on or about August 28, 1944, by the Crescent Chemical Corporation, from Philadelphia, Pa., and charging that the product was a misbranded fungicide and insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, (1) "Germi-tex Sour and Antiseptic * * * Kills Germs * * *" and (2) "Germi-tex Sour and Antiseptic for Colored Work * * * Moth Repellent," borne on the labels affixed to the barrels containing the product, were false and misleading and, by reason thereof, the product was labeled so as to deceive and mislead purchasers since it was not a germicide and antiseptic and would not kill germs as claimed, nor repel moths.

On April 21, 1945, Crescent Chemical Corporation, claimant, having admitted the truth of the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry of a decree, a judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered that the product be released to the claimant under bond to be relabeled under supervision of the Insecticide Division of the U. S. Department of Agriculture so as to comply with the requirements of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

1952. Adulteration and misbranding of "Pine Oil Disinfectant." U. S. v. Maurice Kerns, doing business as Benmar Products. Count one dismissed. Plea of guilty on counts two and three. Fine \$100 and costs. (1. & F. No. 2384. I. D. No. 10010.)

An analysis a sample of "Pine Oil Disinfectant" showed that this product consisted of 51.5 percent water, 1.2 percent sodium oxide, 9.2 percent rosin and fatty anhydride, and 38.1 percent pine oil.

On December 19, 1945, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting on a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Maurice Kerns, doing business under the style and trade name of Benmar Products, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about October 25, 1944, from Chicago, Ill., to Shreveport, La., of a quantity of "Pine Oil Disinfectant" which was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

In count one the product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold because the statements (1) "Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * Guarantee We hereby guarantee this disinfectant to have a phenol coefficient of 5 plus (B. Typhosus—F. D. A. method)" and (2) "Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * We hereby guarantee this disinfectant * * * will conform to all requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and recorded as Commercial Standard CS 69-38 by the National Bureau of Standards of the U. S. Department of Commerce," borne on the labels affixed to the jugs containing said product, purported and represented (1) that the product had a phenol coefficient of not less than 5 plus and (2) that the product conformed to all requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and recorded as Commercial Standard CS 69-38 by the National Bureau of Standards of the U. S. Department of Commerce, whereas the product did not have a phenol coefficient of 5 plus, and did not conform to all requirements of the standard claimed.

In count two the product was alleged to be misbranded in that it consisted partially of an inert substance (water), which did not prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate fungi (bacteria), and the name and percentage amount of such inert ingredient were not stated on the label, nor did the label bear a statement of the names and percentage amounts of each and every ingredient having fungicidal (bactericidal) properties and the total percentage of inert ingredients.

In count three the product was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statements, (1) "Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * Guarantee We hereby guarantee this disinfectant to have a phenol coefficient of 5 plus (B. Typhosus-F. D. A. method)" and (2) "Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * We hereby guarantee this disinfectant * * * will conform to all requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and recorded as Commercial Standard CS 69-38 by the National Bureau of Standards of the U. S. Department of Commerce," borne on the labels affixed to the jugs containing the product, were false and misleading and served to deceive

and mislead the purchaser because said statements purported and represented (1) that the product had a phenol coefficient of 5 plus and (2) that the product would conform to all requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and recorded as Commercial Standard CS 69-38 by the National Bureau of Standards of the United States Department of Commerce, whereas the product did not have a phenol coefficient of 5 plus, and did not conform to all requirements of the standard aforesaid, as claimed.

On January 28, 1945, the defendant moved to dismiss count one, and entered a plea of guilty to counts two and three. The motion was granted by the court, and a fine of \$100 and costs were imposed.

1953. Adulteration and misbranding of "Old Nick's Seed Treatment." U. S. v. 2,216 pint containers, more or less, of "Old Nick's Seed Treatment." Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (I. & F. No. 2409. I. D. No. 10879.)

An examination of samples of "Old Nick's Seed Treatment" disclosed that this product consisted of coal-tar creosote.

On June 17, 1946, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Iowa, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation at Sioux City, Iowa, of 2,216 pint containers, more or less, of "Old Nick's Seed Treatment," alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about January 15 and March 31, 1944, from Rockport, Mo., and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by the Old Nick Seed Treatment Company of Rockport, Mo.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold since it was labeled, "Active Ingredients Cresols 3.05% * * *," whereas the product contained less than 3.05 percent creosols.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the foregoing label statement of ingredients was false and misleading and the product was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser.

The product was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statements, "Old Nick's Seed Treatment * * * Helps protect corn from * * * heart bugs, wireworms * * * or any pest that attacks seed in the ground. * * * Results guaranteed. * * * One tablespoonful to one and one-half gallons of corn mixed in planter box. Mix thoroughly. Do not mix and allow to dry," borne on the labels affixed to the containers in which the product was packed, were false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser in that said product, when used as directed, would not help protect corn from heart bugs and wireworms and all other seed-attacking pests in the ground.

On July 30, 1946, no claimant having appeared, a decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered, and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

1954. Adulteration and misbranding of "Insectilyn DDT 5%." U. S. v. Lynwood E. Storey and Arthur M. Hartman, co-partners, doing business under the style and trade name of Lynwood Products Company. Plea of guilty by defendant Lynwood E. Storey; information dismissed as to defendant Arthur M. Hartman; fine \$1 and costs. (I. & F. No. 2398. I. D. No. 11942.)

Examination of a sample of "Insectilyn DDT 5%" disclosed that the product was a mineral oil solution of a chlorinated compound equivalent to 0.026 percent Dichloro Diphenyl Trichloroethane (DDT).

On July 11, 1946, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed an information in the district court against Lynwood E. Storey and Arthur M. Hartman, co-partners, doing business under the style and trade name of Lynwood Products Company, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about September 21, 1945, from Chicago, Ill., to Pewaukee, Wis., of a quantity of "Insectilyn DDT 5%" which was an adulterated and misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that the statement, "DDT 5%" borne on the labels affixed to the drums containing the product, purported and

represented that its standard or quality was such that the product contained not less than 5 percent of Dichloro Diphenyl Trichloroethane, whereas the strength and purity of said product fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold in that the product contained less than 5 percent DDT.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the foregoing label statement with respect to Dichloro Diphenyl Trichloroethane was false and misleading and the product was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser.

On October 9, 1946, the defendants Lynwood E. Storey and Arthur M. Hartman were arraigned and entered a plea of guilty. On November 13, 1946, the court permitted the defendant Hartman to withdraw his plea of guilty, and upon motion duly made the information was dismissed as to him. The defendant Lynwood E. Storey was fined \$1 and costs.

1955. Misbranding of "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers." U. S. v. 275 "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers," more or less. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (I. & F. No. 2419. I. D. Nos. 949, 950.)

An examination of "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers" showed that this product consisted of a propellant of the nature of Freon 12, DDT, pyrethrins, mineral oil, water, and probably an aromatic petroleum derivative solvent.

On August 5, 1946, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 275 "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers," more or less, at Washington, D. C., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about July 2 and July 19, 1946, from Boston, Mass., to Washington, D. C., and charging that the product was a misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by The Spraymaster Corporation.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the labels affixed to the containers in which said product was packed stated in part:

"Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispenser With 5% DDT and Pyrethrum
* * * Self-propelled by Freon 12 expanding into a very fine mist which permeates every nook and corner of room * * * To operate Spraymaster—
1. Remove tape from valve. 2. Hold dispenser upright with arrow pointing away from you. 3. Turn valve down to start spray and up to stop. DO NOT OPEN BEYOND $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ TURN. 4. Release insecticide into the air. Keep spray at least one foot away from objects. 5. Spray average room 4 to 6 seconds. Use Sparingly. * * * 7. Avoid direct contact with * * * woodwork or clothing * * * Effective Against Flies . Mosquitoes . Ants . Moths . Gnats . Wasps . Silverfish Spraymaster Contains Sufficient Aerosol Insecticide To Spray 100 Average Size Rooms."

"Manufactured to conform with prescribed formulations of Dept. of Agriculture, under U. S. Patents Nos. 2321023 and Re Pat. No. 22700. Others Pending.", which statements purported and represented (1) that said product formed an aerosol which expanded into a fine mist when the bomb or dispenser was operated as directed and which would control flies, mosquitoes, ants, moths, gnats, wasps, and silverfish, if used as directed, and (2) that the bomb or dispenser was manufactured to conform with prescribed formulations of the U. S. Department of Agriculture under U. S. Patents No. 2321023 and Re Pat. No. 22700, with other patents pending, whereas the said product did not form an aerosol which expanded into a fine mist when the bomb was operated as directed and the product did not control flies, mosquitoes, ants, moths, gnats, wasps, and silverfish, if used as directed; and the product did not conform to the formulations designated.

The product was further misbranded within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910 as the said product consisted partially of inert substances (dichloro difluoro methane and water), which did not prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate insects, and the names and percentage amounts of each and every one of such inert ingredients were not stated on the labels affixed to the containers in which the product was packed nor did said labels bear a statement of the names and percentage amounts of each and every ingredient having insecticidal properties and the total percentage of inert ingredients.

On October 30, 1946, no claimant having appeared, default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered and the United States marshal was ordered to destroy the product.

1956. Adulteration and misbranding of "Bartender Pine Disinfectant." U. S. v. 27 one-gallon jugs, more or less, of "Bartender Pine Disinfectant." Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered delivered to the custodian of the Post Office Building at East St. Louis, Ill., for use in cleaning and disinfecting. (I. & F. 2400. I. D. 12159.)

An examination of "Bartender Pine Disinfectant" showed that this product consisted of soap, pine oil, isopropyl alcohol, a small amount of phenolic bodies, and 73 percent of water.

On March 6, 1946, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 27 one-gallon jugs, more or less, of "Bartender Pine Disinfectant" at East St. Louis, Ill., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about December 6, 1945, from St. Louis, Mo., and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by the U-San-O Corporation.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold since it was labeled "Inert material not to exceed 15% Water," whereas the product contained more than 15 percent water.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "Inert material not to exceed 15% Water," borne on the labels affixed to the jugs containing the product, was false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the product contained more than 15 percent water.

On April 24, 1946, no claimant having appeared, a decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered that the product be delivered to the custodian of the Post Office Building at East St. Louis, Ill., for use in cleaning and disinfecting.

1957. Misbranding of "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers." U. S. v. 400 "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers," more or less. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (I. & F. No. 2421. I. D. No. 13465.)

An examination of "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers" showed that this product consisted of a propellant of the nature of Freon 12, DDT, pyrethrins, mineral oil, water, and probably an aromatic petroleum derivative solvent.

On August 12, 1946, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 400 "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers," more or less, at Milwaukee, Wis., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about May 31, 1946, from Boston, Mass., to Milwaukee, Wis., and charging that the product was a misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by The Spraymaster Corporation.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the labels affixed to the containers in which said product was packed stated in part:

"Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispenser With 5% DDT and Pyrethrum
* * * Self-propelled by Freon 12 expanding into a very fine mist which permeates every nook and corner of room * * * To operate Spraymaster—

1. Remove tape from valve.
2. Hold dispenser upright with arrow pointing away from you.
3. Turn valve down to start spray and up to stop. DO NOT OPEN BEYOND ¼ to ½ TURN.

4. Release insecticide into the air. Keep spray at least one foot away from objects.

5. Spray average room 4 to 6 seconds. Use sparingly. * * *
7. Avoid direct contact with * * * woodwork or clothing * * * Effective Against Flies . Mosquitoes . Ants . Moths . Gnats . Wasps . Silverfish
Spraymaster Contains Sufficient Aerosol Insecticide To Spray 100 Average Size Rooms."

"Manufactured to conform with prescribed formulation of Dept. of Agriculture, under U. S. Patents Nos. 2321023 and Re Pat. No. 22700. Others Pending."

which statements purported and represented (1) that said product formed an aerosol which expanded into a fine mist when the bomb or dispenser was operated as directed and which would control flies, mosquitoes, ants, moths,

gnats, wasps, and silverfish, if used as directed, and (2) that the bomb or dispenser was manufactured to conform with prescribed formulations of the U. S. Department of Agriculture under U. S. Patents No. 2321023 and Re Pat. No. 22700, with other patents pending, whereas the said product did not form an aerosol which expanded into a fine mist when the bomb was operated as directed and the product did not control flies, mosquitoes, ants, moths, gnats, wasps, and silverfish, if used as directed; and the product did not conform to the official formulations designated.

The product was further misbranded within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910 as the said product consisted partially of inert substances (dichloro difluoro methane and water), which did not prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate insects, and the names and percentage amounts of each and every one of such inert ingredients were not stated on the label affixed to the containers in which the product was packed nor did said label bear a statement of the names and percentage amounts of each and every ingredient having insecticidal properties and the total percentage of inert ingredients.

On November 14, 1946, no claimant having appeared, default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered and the United States marshal was ordered to destroy the product.

1958. Adulteration and misbranding of "E Z Bleach." U. S. v. 594 half-gallon containers and 96 gallon containers, more or less, of "E Z Bleach." Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released to claimant for relabeling. (I. & F. 2399. I. D. No. 11968.)

Examination of samples of "E Z Bleach" showed that this product was a sodium hypochlorite solution, and contained 4.76 percent of sodium hypochlorite.

On January 7, 1946, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Iowa, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 594 half-gallon containers and 96 gallon containers of "E Z Bleach" at Des Moines, Iowa, alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about October 29, 1945, from Peoria, Ill., and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by the Central City Pickle Company.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold since it was labeled "Active Ingredients: Sodium Hypochlorite 5.25% by weight, Inert Ingredients 94.75% by weight," whereas the product contained less than 5.25 percent sodium hypochlorite by weight and more than 94.75 percent inert ingredients by weight.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "Active Ingredients: Sodium Hypochlorite 5.25% by weight, Inert Ingredients 94.75% by weight," borne on the labels affixed to containers of the product, was false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the product contained less than 5.25 percent sodium hypochlorite by weight and more than 94.75 percent inert ingredients by weight.

On April 11, 1946, the Central City Pickle Company having appeared as claimant and admitted the allegations of the libel, a decree of forfeiture and condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be released to the claimant, under bond, to be relabeled so as to comply with the requirements of the Insecticide Act of 1910, such relabeling to be done under the supervision of the United States marshal.

1959. Adulteration and misbranding of "Pine Oil Disinfectant." U. S. v. 7 five-gallon drums of "Pine Oil Disinfectant." Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered destroyed. (I. & F. No. 2391. I. D. No. 11805.)

An examination of "Pine Oil Disinfectant" showed that this product consisted of 43.5 percent water, 1.8 percent isopropyl alcohol, and 54.7 percent pine oil and soap.

On August 29, 1945, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 7 five-gallon drums of "Pine Oil Disinfectant" at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about April 16, 1945, from Chicago,

Ill., by the Benmar Products, and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, as the statements, (1) "Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * Guarantee We hereby guarantee this Disinfectant to have a phenol coefficient of 3 plus (B. Typhosus—F. D. A. Method)," and (2) "We hereby guarantee this Disinfectant * * * will conform to all requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and recorded as Commercial Standard CS 69-38 by the National Bureau of Standards of the U. S. Department of Commerce," borne on the labels affixed to the drums containing the product, purported and represented that the product had a phenol coefficient of 3 plus (B. Typhosus—F. D. A. Method), and that the product conformed to the requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and recorded as Commercial Standard CS 69-38 by the National Bureau of Standards of the U. S. Department of Commerce, whereas the product did not possess a phenol coefficient of 3 plus (B. Typhosus—F. D. A. Method), and did not conform to the requirements of the standards adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, (1) "Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * Guarantee We hereby guarantee this Disinfectant to have a phenol coefficient of 3 plus (B. Typhosus—F. D. A. Method)," (2) "We hereby guarantee this Disinfectant * * * will conform to all requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and recorded as Commercial Standard CS 69-38 by the National Bureau of Standards of the U. S. Department of Commerce," and (3) "Disinfects, * * * Directions Use a solution of 1 part disinfectant to 70 parts water * * *" borne on the labels affixed to the drums containing the product, were false and misleading and the article was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, because the statements purported and represented (1) that the product possessed a phenol coefficient of 3 plus (B. Typhosus—F. D. A. Method), (2) that the product conformed to all the requirements of the said standard claimed, and (3) that the product could be relied upon to disinfect when diluted as directed, whereas (1) the product did not possess a phenol coefficient of 3 plus (B. Typhosus—F. D. A. Method), (2) did not conform to all the requirements of the standard adopted by the National Association of Insecticide and Disinfectant Manufacturers, Inc., and (3) could not be relied upon to disinfect when diluted as directed.

The product was further misbranded in that it consisted partially of an inert substance (water) which did not prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate insects or fungi (bacteria), and the product did not have the name and percentage amount of each and every one of such inert ingredients stated on the label, nor did the label bear a statement of the name and percentage amount of the ingredients having insecticidal or fungicidal (bactericidal) properties and the total percentage of inert ingredients.

On September 18, 1945, no claimant having appeared, a decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

1960. Misbranding and adulteration of "Banner American Beauty Pine Oil Disinfectant." U. S. v. Three 55-gallon drums of "Banner American Beauty Pine Oil Disinfectant." Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (I. & F. 2392. I. D. No. 9585.)

An examination of "Banner American Beauty Pine Oil Disinfectant" showed that this product consisted of approximately 26 percent water and 25 percent mineral oil, together with pine oil and soap.

On September 28, 1945, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of three 55-gallon drums of "Banner American Beauty Pine Oil Disinfectant" at Raleigh, N. C., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about April 4, 1945, from Newark, N. J., and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by Banner Chemical Products Company.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, in that mineral

oil and water had been substituted in part for the product, that is to say, for pine oil disinfectant made from pure steam distilled pine oil.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that it contained inert ingredients and its labels failed to bear a correct ingredient statement, as provided by law, and in that the statement "Inert Material (water) not over 15%," borne on the labels affixed to the drums containing the product, was false and misleading, and, by reason of this statement, the product was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser since the product contained more than 15 percent water, and it contained an inert ingredient in addition to water, namely, mineral oil.

The product was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statements, "Banner American Beauty Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * Banner Pine Oil Disinfectant * * * Directions and uses For Urinals and Toilets * * * They should be cleaned daily with a pail of water containing $\frac{1}{2}$ Pint of Disinfectant to every 10 quarts of water," borne on the labels, were false and misleading and the product was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, because the statements implied that the product was pine oil disinfectant and would disinfect when diluted as directed, whereas the product was not pine oil disinfectant and it could not be relied upon as a disinfectant when used as directed.

On November 21, 1945, no claimant having appeared, a decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

1961. Misbranding of "A-1 Pino Disinfectant." U. S. v. Harold D. Arnold, trading as Sanitary Chemical Laboratories. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine \$50. (I. & F. No. 2389. I. D. No. 10907.)

Examination of a sample of "A-1 Pino Disinfectant" showed that this product contained approximately 79 percent of water and its label did not bear the required ingredient statement.

On August 27, 1945, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Harold D. Arnold, trading as Sanitary Chemical Laboratories, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about April 24, 1945, from Beaumont, Tex., into the State of Louisiana, of a quantity of "A-1 Pino Disinfectant" which was a misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be misbranded because it consisted partially of an inert substance, namely, water, and the name and percentage amount were not stated plainly and correctly on the label, nor in lieu thereof were the name and percentage amount of each and every substance or ingredient of the product having fungicidal properties and the total percentage of the inert substances present therein stated plainly and correctly on the label.

On August 27, 1945, a plea of nolo contendere was entered and a fine of \$50 was imposed.

1962. Misbranding of "Mortolin W Improved." U. S. v. Associated Chemists, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine \$100 and costs. (I. & F. No. 2380. I. D. No. 5548.)

Analysis of a sample of "Mortolin W Improved" showed that this product consisted of 6.32 percent of magnesium silicofluoride, 93.3 percent of water, and a small amount of wetting agent. The label failed to bear the required ingredient statement.

On December 19, 1945, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Associated Chemists, Inc., Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about June 2, 1944, from Chicago, Ill., into the State of New York of a quantity of "Mortolin W Improved" which was a misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be misbranded because it consisted partially of inert substances (substances other than magnesium silicofluoride) and the names and percentage amounts thereof were not stated on the label; nor, in lieu thereof, were the name and percentage amount of each and every substance or ingredient having insecticidal properties, and the total percentage of inert substances present therein stated plainly and correctly on the label.

On January 28, 1946, a plea of guilty was entered and a fine of \$100 and costs were imposed.

1963. Adulteration and misbranding of "Miracle Roach and Water Bug Killer" and misbranding of "Miracle Insecticide." U. S. v. Joseph Mandlebaum, doing business under the style and trade name of United Chemical Company. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine \$50. (I. & F. No. 2381. I. D. Nos. 8148, 8149.)

Examination of a sample of "Miracle Roach and Water Bug Killer" showed that this product consisted of 49.1 percent of boric acid and a starchy material.

Examination of a sample of "Miracle Insecticide" showed that this product consisted of light mineral oil containing yellow coloring and a slight amount of perfume.

On June 16, 1945, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed an information in the district court against Joseph Mandlebaum, doing business under the style and trade name of United Chemical Company, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about July 6, 1944, from New Orleans, La., to Picayune, Miss., of a quantity of "Miracle Roach and Waterbug Killer," which was an adulterated and misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The information alleged also that, on or about July 6, 1944, Joseph Mandlebaum, doing business under the style and trade name of United Chemical Company, shipped in interstate commerce from New Orleans, La., to Picayune, Miss., a quantity of "Miracle Insecticide" which was a misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The "Miracle Roach and Waterbug Killer" was alleged to be adulterated because its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, as the product was labeled "Inert Ingredients 46 percent, Active ingredients 54 percent," whereas it contained less than 54 percent active ingredients and more than 46 percent inert ingredients.

The "Miracle Roach and Waterbug Killer" was alleged to be misbranded because the labels affixed to the containers of the product bore the statements "Miracle Roach and Waterbug Killer Inert Ingredients 46% Active Ingredients 54%," whereas the product contained less than 54 percent of active ingredients and more than 46 percent of inert ingredients.

The product was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statements "non poison" and "Cont. 4 oz.," borne on the labels affixed to the containers containing the product, were false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser, because the product was not nonpoisonous and the net contents were less than 4 ounces.

The product was alleged to be still further misbranded in that it consisted partially of inert substances (substances other than boric acid), which did not prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate insects, and the name and percentage amount of each and every one of such ingredients were not stated on the label, nor did the label bear a statement of the name and percentage amount of the ingredient having insecticidal properties, and the total percentage of inert ingredients.

The "Miracle Insecticide" was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements,

"Miracle Insecticide

Kills Mosquitoes, Roaches * * * Chicken Lice * * * Flies * * *

Etc.

When Miracle Kills 'Em, They Stay Dead!

Directions

Use In Any Spray Gun

To Kill Mosquitoes and Flies

Close all windows, and spray Miracle freely into the air, and directly on insects when possible.

*To Kill Roaches, Ants * * * Chicken Lice, Etc. * * **

Spray liberally once a day in cracks and crevices where insects like to hide.

Kills eggs and larvae as well as adults,"

borne on the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product, were false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser, as the product, when used as directed, would not kill flies, mosquitoes, roaches, ants, eggs and larvae, chicken lice, and all insects included in the abbreviation "etc."

On April 12, 1946, a plea of nolo contendere was entered and a fine of \$50 was imposed.

1964. Adulteration and misbranding of "D. D. T. Liquid Spray." U. S. v. Melvin M. Guggenheim, doing business under the style and trade name of Paint Specialties Sales Company. Plea of guilty. Fine \$200 and costs. (I. & F. No. 2414. I. D. No. 11937.)

Analysis of a sample of "D. D. T. Liquid Spray" showed that this product contained mineral oil, 1.51 percent of organic thiocyanates, and 0.70 percent dichloro diphenyl trichloroethane.

On September 4, 1946, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Melvin M. Guggenheim, an individual, doing business under the style and trade name of Paint Specialties Sales Company, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about September 20, 1945, from Chicago, Ill., to Racine, Wis., of a quantity of "D. D. T. Liquid Spray" which was an adulterated and misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

In count one the product was alleged, to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, as the labels affixed to the containers in which the product was packed stated: "This product contains 3% D. D. T.—2% Thanite," whereas the product contained less than 3 percent dichloro diphenyl trichloroethane (D. D. T.) and less than 2 percent Thanite (organic thiocyanates).

In count two the product was alleged to be misbranded in that the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product stated in part: (1) "D. D. T. Liquid Spray," (2) "This product contains 3% D. D. T.—2% Thanite," and (3) "D. D. T. Liquid Spray Kills * * * Mosquitoes—Flies * * * Etc. * * * Directions for Flies and Mosquitoes: Spray in air and on walls or places of breeding," which statements were false and misleading and would serve to deceive and mislead the purchasers in that (1) the product contained only a small amount of dichloro diphenyl trichloroethane (D. D. T.), (2) the product contained less than 3 percent dichloro diphenyl trichloroethane (D. D. T.) and less than 2 percent Thanite (organic thiocyanates), and (3) the product, when used as directed, would not kill flies and mosquitoes, nor all insects that might be included in the claim "D. D. T. Liquid Spray Kills * * * Mosquitoes * * * Flies * * * Etc."

On September 30, 1946, a plea of guilty was entered and a fine of \$200 and costs were imposed.

1965. Adulteration and misbranding of "Hi-Tox 20." U. S. v. Associated Chemists, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine \$150 and costs. (I. & F. No. 2390. I. D. No. 10312.)

An examination of "Ti-Tox 20" showed that this product consisted of mineral oil of the nature of deodorized kerosene, a chlorinated compound, coloring matter, and a very small amount of nitrogenous material. The product was represented by implication as possessing a strength comparable to a 20-1 concentrated fly spray, whereas tests on one of the undiluted samples against bred flies in the Peet-Grady chamber gave an average knockdown of 14 percent and a kill of 4 percent, and comparative tests with the Official Test Insecticide gave an average knockdown of 97 percent and a kill of 65 percent. Similar tests on samples of the product at a dilution of 1 part to 19 parts of deodorized kerosene gave average knockdowns of 19 percent and 22 percent and kills of 7 percent and 8 percent, respectively. Comparative tests with the Official Test Insecticide gave an average knockdown of 95 percent, and a kill of 60 percent.

On January 18, 1946, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Associated Chemists, Inc., alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about February 23, 1944, from Chicago, Ill., into the State of California, of a quantity of "Hi-Tox 20," and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that the statement "HI-TOX 20 in odorless base," borne on the drums containing the product, purported and represented that the product's standard or quality was such that the product had a strength equivalent to a 20-1 concentrated fly spray, whereas the strength or purity of the product fell below such standard or quality in that the product did not possess a strength equivalent to a 20-1 concentrated fly spray.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the label statement quoted above was false and misleading so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser in that the statement purported and represented by implication that the product possessed a strength comparable to a 20-1 concentrated fly spray, whereas the product did not possess such a strength.

On January 28, 1946, a plea of guilty was entered, and the court imposed a fine of \$150 and costs.

1966. Adulteration and misbranding of "Sun-X Sterilizer Bleach." U. S. v. 3,452 quart and 318 one-half gallon containers, more or less, of "Sun-X Sterilizer Bleach." Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (I. & F. No. 2396. I. D. No. 12058.)

An analysis of "Sun-X Sterilizer Bleach" showed that this product contained 40.57 percent less sodium hypochlorite than was stated on the label.

On Nov. 8, 1945, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Iowa, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 3,452 quart and 318 one-half gallon containers of "Sun-X Sterilizer Bleach" at Ottumwa, Iowa, alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about September 7, 1945, from Springfield, Ill., and charging that the product was a misbranded and adulterated fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by the C. G. Whitlock Company.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold since it was labeled "Sodium Hypochlorite 5.25%, Inert Ingredients 94.75% By Weight," whereas it contained less than 5.25 percent sodium hypochlorite and more than 94.75 percent of inert ingredients.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "Sodium Hypochlorite 5.25%, Inert Ingredients 94.75% By Weight," borne on the labels affixed to containers of the product, were false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the product contained less than 5.25 percent sodium hypochlorite and more than 94.75 percent inert ingredients.

The product was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statement, "Sun-X Sterilizer Bleach * * * available chlorine solution of 200 parts per million is prepared by adding 1 ounce of Sun-X to 2 gallons of water," borne on the labels affixed to the containers in which the product was packed, was false and misleading, and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the statement purported and represented that the product was a sterilizer which provided a solution containing 200 parts per million available chlorine when 1 ounce of the product was diluted with 2 gallons of water and which could be relied upon to disinfect when so diluted, whereas the product was not a sterilizer, did not provide a solution containing 200 parts per million of available chlorine when diluted as directed, and would not disinfect when diluted as directed.

On January 3, 1946, no claimant having appeared, a decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

1967. Misbranding of "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers." U. S. v. 64 "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers." Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (I. & F. No. 2417. I. D. No. 13307.)

An examination of "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers" showed that this product consisted of a propellant of the nature of Freon 12, pyrethrins extract, DDT, water, and probably an aromatic petroleum derivative solvent.

On August 2, 1946, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 64 "Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispensers," more or less, at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about June 4, 1946, from Boston, Mass., and charging that the product was a misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by The Spraymaster Corporation.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the labels affixed to the containers in which said product was packed stated in part:

"Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dispenser With 5% DDT and Pyrethrum * * * Self-propelled by Freon 12 expanding into a very fine mist which permeates every nook and corner of room * * * To operate Spray-

master—1. Remove tape from valve. 2. Hold dispenser upright with arrow pointing away from you. 3. Turn valve down to start spray and up to stop. **DO NOT OPEN BEYOND $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ TURN.** 4. Release insecticide into the air. Keep spray at least one foot away from objects. 5. Spray average room 4 to 6 seconds. Use sparingly. * * * 7. Avoid direct contact with * * * woodwork or clothing * * * Effective Against Flies . Mosquitoes . Ants . Moths . Gnats . Wasps . Silverfish Spraymaster Contains Sufficient Aerosol Insecticide to Spray 100 Average Size Rooms.” “Manufactured to conform with prescribed formulations of Dept. of Agriculture, under U. S. Patents Nos. 2321023 and Re Pat. No. 22700. Others Pending,” which statements purported and represented (1) that said product formed an aerosol which expanded into a fine mist when the bomb or dispenser was operated as directed and which would control flies, mosquitoes, ants, moths, gnats, wasps, and silverfish, if used as directed, and (2) that the bomb or dispenser was manufactured to conform with prescribed formulations of the U. S. Department of Agriculture under U. S. Patents No. 2321023 and Re Pat. No. 22700, with other patents pending, whereas the said product did not form an aerosol, did not expand into a fine mist when the bomb was operated as directed, and the product did not control flies, mosquitoes, ants, moths, gnats, wasps, and silverfish, if used as directed; and the product did not conform with the formulations designated.

The product was further misbranded within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910 in that said product consisted partially of inert substances (dichloro difluoro methane and water), which did not prevent, destroy, repel, or mitigate insects, and the names and percentage amounts of each and every one of such inert ingredients were not stated on the labels affixed to the containers in which the product was packed, nor did said labels bear a statement of the names and percentage amounts of each and every ingredient having insecticidal properties and the total percentage of inert ingredients.

On October 15, 1946, no claimant having appeared, default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered and the United States marshal was ordered to destroy the product.

1968. Adulteration and misbranding of “All-Nu Pine Petroleum Disinfectant.”
U. S. v. All-Nu Products Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine \$600.
 (I. & F. No. 2393. I. D. No. 9543.)

An examination of “All-Nu Pine Petroleum Disinfectant” showed that this product consisted of pine oil, mineral oil, soap, and water, and it was found to possess a phenol coefficient of 1.1.

On January 24, 1946, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against All-Nu Products Co., a corporation, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about February 7, 1945, from Camden, N. J., to Roanoke, Va., of a quantity of “All-Nu Pine Petroleum Disinfectant” which was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold because the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product stated in part, “All-Nu Pine Disinfectant F. D. A. Coef. 2,” whereas the product did not possess a phenol coefficient of 2.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, “All-Nu Pine Petroleum Disinfectant is ideal for use in public places as well as the home. For disinfecting * * * of bathtubs, shower stalls, basins, or toilets in schools, hotels, theatres, stores, factories, office buildings, bath houses or locker rooms. * * * Directions Spray or mop freely, using a solution of one (1) part to forty (40) parts of water. * * * F. D. A. Coefficient 2,” borne on the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product, were false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser because the statements purported and represented that the product was ideal for use in public places, and the home, and could be relied upon as a disinfectant or for disinfecting purposes when diluted as directed, and that the product possessed a phenol coefficient of not less than 2, whereas the product was not ideal for use in public places and the home; could not be relied upon as a disinfectant, or for disinfectant purposes when diluted as directed; and the product possessed a phenol coefficient of less than 2.

A plea of guilty was entered on March 1, 1946, and a fine of \$600 was imposed.

1969. Adulteration and misbranding of "Butcher Brand Free Nicotine Dust No. 10. U. S. v. 18 five-pound packages and 66 one-pound packages of "Butcher Brand Free Nicotine Dust No. 10." Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered destroyed. (I. & F. No. 2378. I. D. No. 10542.)

Analysis of a sample of "Butcher Brand Free Nicotine Dust No. 10" showed that the product consisted of nicotine alkaloid, siliceous materials, and a small amount of iron, aluminum, copper, calcium, and sulphate compounds. The product was found to contain an average of 1.7 percent of nicotine alkaloid.

On March 9, 1945, the United States attorney for the District of Arizona, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel, praying seizure and condemnation of 18 five-pound packages and 66 one-pound packages of "Butcher Brand Free Nicotine Dust No. 10" at Phoenix, Ariz., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 23, 1944, from Los Angeles, Calif., by the L. H. Butcher Company, and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be adulterated, in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold in that the statements, "Active Ingredient: Nicotine Alkaloid 3.60, Inert Ingredients 96.40," borne on the labels affixed to the packages containing the product, purported that the standard or quality of the product was such that it had a nicotine alkaloid content of not less than 3.60 percent and that the inert ingredients were not in excess of 96.40 percent, whereas the product's strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which the product was sold as it contained less than 3.60 percent nicotine, and more than 96.40 percent inert ingredients.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, (1) "Active Ingredient: Nicotine Alkaloid 3.60, Inert Ingredients 96.40" and (2) "Butcher Brand Free Nicotine Dust No. 10 * * * Kills or controls * * * White Flies and Similar Insects. * * * Apply with a hand duster when insects are present on plants and when air is quiet, preferably in early morning," borne on the labels affixed to the packages containing the product, were false and misleading and the product was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser because the statements purported and represented (1) that the product contained not less than 3.60 percent nicotine, and not more than 96.40 percent inert ingredients and (2) that the product, when used as directed, would control white flies and all similar insects, whereas the product contained less than 3.60 percent nicotine, and more than 96.40 percent inert ingredients, and when used as directed would not control white flies and all similar insects.

On September 26, 1945, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

1970. Adulteration and misbranding of "DeWitt Liquor Cresolis Saponatus," U. S. v. The Zep Manufacturing Co., a corporation, doing business as the DeWitt Supply Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine \$200. (I. & F. 2334. I. D. No. 7310.)

Analysis of a sample of "DeWitt Liquor Cresolis Saponatus" showed that this product consisted of water, 22.8 percent; sodium oxide, 1.7 percent; fatty anhydride, 24.1 percent; glycerine, 1.0 percent; and tar acids, 50.5 percent. The tar acids distilled mainly above 205° C. and were not cresol.

On August 1, 1945, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against The Zep Manufacturing Co., a corporation, doing business as the DeWitt Supply Co., alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about March 31, 1943, from Atlanta, Ga., into the State of Alabama, of a quantity of "DeWitt Liquor Cresolis Saponatus" which was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold as the product was labeled "Inert Substances: Glycerine 3 percent, Water 15 percent," whereas the product contained more than 15 percent water.

The product was alleged to be further adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold as other phenols had been substituted in part for cresols.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements borne on the labels affixed to the one-gallon jugs were false and misleading and tended

to deceive and mislead the purchaser because the product contained more than 15 percent water, and further the product was not Liquor Cresolis Saponatus as it contained an excess of water and phenols other than cresols.

On October 1, 1945, a plea of nolo contendere was entered and a fine of \$200 was imposed.

1971. Adulteration and misbranding of "Bartender Pine Disinfectant." U. S. v. U-San-O Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine \$100. (I. & F. No. 2412. I. D. No. 12159.)

An examination of "Bartender Pine Disinfectant" showed that this product consisted of soap, pine oil, isopropyl alcohol, a small amount of phenolic bodies, and 73 percent of water.

On August 26, 1946, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the U-San-O Corporation, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about December 6, 1945, from St. Louis, Mo., to East St. Louis, Ill., of a quantity of "Bartender Pine Oil Disinfectant" which was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard of quality under which it was sold, since it was labeled "Inert material not to exceed 15% Water," whereas it contained more than 15 percent water.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Inert material not to exceed 15% Water," borne on the labels affixed to the jugs containing the product, was false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the product contained more than 15 percent water.

On September 16, 1946, a plea of nolo contendere was entered and a fine of \$100 was imposed.

1972. Misbranding of "Ward's Garden Club Powdered Tobacco Dust." U. S. v. Richard W. Leonard, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine \$50 and costs. (I. & F. No. 2354. I. D. Nos. 5942, 9318.)

An examination showed that the average net content of the bags of "Ward's Garden Club Powdered Tobacco Dust" was 4.71 pounds, a shortage of 5.8 percent of the amount claimed on the labels.

On February 15, 1946, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Richard W. Leonard, Inc., alleging shipments in interstate commerce, on or about September 17, 1942, and September 14, 1943, from Chicago, Ill., into the State of Minnesota, of quantities of "Ward's Garden Club Powdered Tobacco Dust" which was a misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "Net Weight 5 lbs.," borne on the labels affixed to the bags containing the product, was false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the bags contained less than 5 pounds.

On February 15, 1946, a plea of guilty was entered, and a fine of \$50 and costs were imposed.

1973. Adulteration and misbranding of "Sani Pine." U. S. v. Sani-Pine Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine \$100 on each of counts one and two; counts three and four dismissed. (I. & F. No. 2385. I. D. Nos. 9708, 9713, 9714.)

Analyses of samples of "Sani Pine" showed that the product consisted of soap, water, and pine oil. The average water content of the samples examined was 32.2 percent, and the phenol coefficients of the samples were 1.75, 2.5, and 1.0.

On June 26, 1945, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York, acting upon a request by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Sani-Pine Corporation, alleging shipments in interstate commerce, on or about October 18, 1944, and September 21, 1944, from Brooklyn, N. Y., to East Orange, N. J., and Irvington, N. J., of quantities of "Sani Pine" which was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

In count one the product, shipped on October 18, 1944, was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality

under which it was sold, as the product was labeled (1) "Inert water (10%)" and (2) "Sani Pine * * * Disinfectant * * * Sani Pine * * * has a guaranteed bacteriological potency of 3.5 times that of phenol when tested by methods of U. S. Public Health Service or by F. D. A. method of U. S. Department of Agriculture," whereas the product contained more than 10 percent water, and had a phenol coefficient of less than 3.5.

In count two the product was alleged to be misbranded because the statements, (1) "Inert Water (10%)", (2) "Sani-Pine * * * Disinfectant * * * Sani Pine * * * has a guaranteed bacteriological potency of 3.5 times that of phenol, when tested by methods of U. S. Public Health Service or by F. D. A. method of U. S. Department of Agriculture * * * To disinfect drains * * *", (3) "Sani Pine * * * For household pests Full Strength (Undiluted)," and (4) "Sani Pine in dilutions indicated is the modern protection against harmful germs," borne on the labels affixed to the wrappers and bottles containing the product, were false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser because the statements purported and represented (1) that the product contained not more than 10 percent water, (2) that the product had a phenol coefficient of not less than 3.5 and would disinfect drains, (3) that the product would control all household pests, and (4) that the product was a protection against all harmful germs, whereas the product contained more than 10 percent water, had a phenol coefficient of less than 3.5, would not disinfect drains, would not control all household pests, and was not a protection against all harmful germs.

In count three the product, shipped on September 21, 1944, was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, as the product was labeled (1) "Inert water (10%)" and (2) "Sani Pine * * * Disinfectant * * * Sani Pine * * * has a guaranteed bacteriological potency of 3.5 times that of phenol when tested by methods of U. S. Public Health Service or by F. D. A. method of U. S. Department of Agriculture," whereas the product contained more than 10 percent water, and had a phenol coefficient of less than 3.5.

In count four the product, shipped on September 21, 1944, was alleged to be misbranded because the statements, (1) "Inert Water (10%)" and (2) "Sani Pine * * * Disinfectant * * * Sani Pine has a guaranteed bacteriological potency of 3.5 times that of phenol, when tested by methods of U. S. Public Health Service or by F. D. A. method of U. S. Department of Agriculture," borne on the wrappers and on the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product, were false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser, as the product contained more than 10 percent water and had a phenol coefficient of less than 3.5.

The product was alleged to be further misbranded because the statements, (1) "Sani Pine in dilutions indicated is the modern protection against harmful germs," (2) "To disinfect drains," and (3) "For household pests Full Strength (Undiluted)," borne on the wrappers and on the labels affixed to the pint bottles containing the product, were false and misleading and served to deceive and mislead the purchaser because the product was not a protection against all harmful germs, would not disinfect drains, and would not control all household pests.

The defendant filed a demurrer, alleging (1) that the offenses charged in the information did not constitute a crime and (2) that the information was defective in that it did not allege that the defendant willfully and unlawfully committed the offenses charged. The demurrer was answered on October 17, 1945, and on October 24, 1945, the demurrer was overruled by the court. A plea of guilty was entered, and on November 8, 1945, a fine of \$100 was imposed on each of counts one and two; counts three and four were dismissed.

1974. Misbranding of "Glessner's G-B Fly and Household Spray" and adulteration and misbranding of "P. O. P. Fly and Household Spray." U. S. v. Leroy C. Glessner, doing business under the style and trade name of Glessner Brothers. Plea of guilty. Fine \$25 and costs. (I. & F. 2360. I. D. Nos. 5355 and 9249.)

Examination of a sample of "Glessner's G-B Fly and Household Spray" showed that this product consisted of mineral oil, organic thiocyanates, and perfume.

Examination of a sample of "P. O. P. Fly and Household Spray" showed that this product consisted of mineral oil containing organic thiocyanates and pine oil. No pyrethrum extract was present.

In September 1944, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed an information in the district court against Leroy C. Glessner, doing business under the style and trade name of Glessner Brothers, alleging shipment in interstate commerce, on or about June 30, 1943, from Eldena, Ill., to Terre Haute, Ind., of a quantity of "Glessner's G-B Fly and Household Spray" which was a misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The information alleged also that, on or about August 11, 1943, Leroy C. Glessner, doing business under the style and trade name of Glessner Brothers, shipped in interstate commerce from Eldena, Ill., to Janesville, Wis., a quantity of "P. O. P. Fly and Household Spray" which was an adulterated and misbranded insecticide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910.

The "G-B Fly and Household Spray" was alleged to be misbranded because the statements, "Glessner's G-B Fly and Household Spray * * *

Directions

For Flies. * * * —

Close doors and windows, directing spray upward toward the ceiling. The room should be filled with mist, and remain closed for ten or twenty minutes. Sweep up dead and stupefied insects and destroy them.

For Roaches, * * * Waterbugs * * * —

Spray liberally with force around refrigerators, sinks, all cabinets, and around pantry shelves, into all cracks and crevices in moulding and woodwork, pipe openings in walls and floors.

Repeat treatment as often as necessary.

Kills Flies, * * * Roaches, * * * Water Bugs, * * * when used as directed,"

borne on the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product, were false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser, as the product, when used as directed, would not be effective in controlling flies, roaches, and waterbugs.

The "P. O. P. Fly and Household Spray" was alleged to be adulterated because the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product bore the statement "P. O. P. Pine Oil Pyrethrum," whereas the product's strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which the product was offered for sale as other substances had been substituted for pyrethrum.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement, "P. O. P. Pine Oil Pyrethrum," borne on the labels, was false and misleading because the statement purported and represented that the product contained pyrethrum, whereas the product did not contain pyrethrum.

The product was alleged to be further misbranded in that the statements,

"P. O. P. Fly and Household Spray * * *

Directions

For Flies, * * *

Close doors and windows, directing spray upward toward the ceiling. The room should be filled with mist, and remain closed for ten or twenty minutes. Sweep up dead and stupefied insects and destroy them.

For Roaches, * * * Waterbugs * * *

Spray liberally with force around refrigerators, sinks, all cabinets, and around pantry shelves, into all cracks and crevices in moulding and woodwork, pipe openings in walls and floors. Repeat treatment as often as necessary. Kills Flies, * * * Roaches, * * * Water Bugs, * * * when used as directed,"

borne on the labels affixed to the bottles containing the product, were false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser since the product, when used as directed, would not be effective in controlling flies, roaches, and waterbugs.

On October 15, 1945, a plea of guilty was entered and a fine of \$25 and costs were imposed.

1975. Adulteration and misbranding of "Fleecy White Laundry Bleach." U. S. v. 2,008 quart containers and 902 one-half gallon containers, more or less, of "Fleecy White Laundry Bleach." Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (I. & F. No. 2401. I. D. No. 12812.)

Examination of samples of "Fleecy White Laundry Bleach" showed that this product was a sodium hypochlorite solution and contained 4.24 percent of sodium hypochlorite.

On April 8, 1946, the United States attorney for the Western District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 2,008 quart containers and 902 one-half gallon containers of "Fleecy White Laundry Bleach," at Grand Rapids, Mich., alleging that the product had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about March 7, 1946, from Chicago, Ill., and charging that the product was an adulterated and misbranded fungicide within the meaning of the Insecticide Act of 1910. The shipment was made by the John Puhl Products Company.

The product was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength or purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold since it was labeled "Active Ingredients: Sodium Hypochlorite 5.25% By Weight Inert Ingredients 94.75% By Weight," whereas it contained less than 5.25 percent sodium hypochlorite by weight and more than 94.75 percent inert ingredients by weight.

The product was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements, "Active Ingredients: Sodium Hypochlorite 5.25% By Weight Inert Ingredients 94.75% By Weight," borne on the labels affixed to containers of the product, were false and misleading and tended to deceive and mislead the purchaser since the product contained less than 5.25 percent sodium hypochlorite by weight and more than 94.75 percent inert ingredients by weight.

On April 18, 1946, no claimant having appeared, a decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

INDEX TO NOTICES OF JUDGMENT 1950-1975

| | N. J. No. | | N. J. No. |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| All-Nu Pine Petroleum Disinfectant: | | Insectilyn DDT 5%—Continued. | |
| All-Nu Products Co.----- | 1968 | Arthur M. Hartman----- | 1954 |
| A-1 Pino Disinfectant: | | Lynwood Products Company----- | 1954 |
| Harold D. Arnold----- | 1961 | Kitchen Klenzer: | |
| Sanitary Chemical Laboratories-- | 1961 | Midland Warehouse, Inc.----- | 1950 |
| Banner American Beauty Pine Oil | | Miracle Roach and Water Bug Killer | |
| Disinfectant: | | and Miracle Insecticide: | |
| Banner Chemical Products Co.-- | 1960 | Joseph Mandelbaum----- | 1963 |
| Bartender Pine Disinfectant: | | United Chemical Company----- | 1963 |
| U-San-O Corporation----- | 1956 | Mortolin W Improved: | |
| Bartender Pine Disinfectant: | | Associated Chemists, Inc.----- | 1962 |
| U-San-O Corporation----- | 1971 | Old Nick's Seed Treatment: | |
| Butcher Brand Free Nicotine Dust | | Old Nick Seed Treatment Com- | |
| No. 10: | | pany----- | 1953 |
| L. H. Butcher Company----- | 1969 | Pine Oil Disinfectant: | |
| D. D. T. Liquid Spray: | | Maurice Kerns----- | 1952 |
| Melvin M. Guggenheim----- | 1964 | Benmar Products----- | 1952 |
| Paint Specialties Sales Com- | | Pine Oil Disinfectant: | |
| pany----- | 1964 | Benmar Products----- | 1959 |
| DeWitt Liquor Cresolis Saponatus: | | Sani Pine: | |
| The Zep Manufacturing Co.----- | 1970 | Sani-Pine Corporation----- | 1973 |
| DeWitt Supply Co.----- | 1970 | Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dis- | |
| E Z Bleach: | | pensers: | |
| Central City Pickle Company--- | 1958 | The Spraymaster Corporation--- | 1955 |
| Fleecy White Laundry Bleach: | | Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dis- | |
| John Puhl Products Company-- | 1975 | pensers: | |
| GermiteX: | | The Spraymaster Corporation--- | 1957 |
| Crescent Chemical Corporation-- | 1951 | Spraymaster Aerosol Insecticide Dis- | |
| Glessner's G-B Fly and Household | | pensers: | |
| Spray: | | The Spraymaster Corporation--- | 1967 |
| Leroy C. Glessner----- | 1974 | Sun-X Sterilizer Bleach: | |
| Glessner Brothers----- | 1974 | C. G. Whitlock Company----- | 1966 |
| Hi-Tox 20: | | Ward's Garden Club Powdered To- | |
| Associated Chemists, Inc.----- | 1965 | bacco Dust: | |
| Insectilyn DDT 5%: | | Richard W. Leonard, Inc.----- | 1972 |
| Lynwood E. Storey----- | 1954 | | |